

Gratias agamus Deo: a reflection on specificity in our eucharistic prayers

Thomas O'Loughlin

ORCID 0000-0002-6333-3991

It is now almost fifty years since the introduction of a variety of eucharistic prayers in the Roman rite. Over that time we have become so familiar with the idea of a variety of Prayers that it is hard to imagine how controversial the idea of any companions for the Roman Canon seemed when it was first mooted by Hans Küng around the time of the Council.¹ However, we may also have become so familiar with the prayers that have become standard elements within our liturgy that we may not recognize that the journey towards a better liturgy is not confined to great moments of reform (such as that which occurred after the Second Vatican Council) but is a continuing process. It is the purpose of this paper to draw attention to just one aspect of this process, highlighting some aspects of the anaphora to which we need to give more consideration in future.

¹ Hans Küng, 'Das Eucharistiegebet: Konzil und Erneuerung der römischen Messliturgie,' *Wort und Wahrheit* 18(1963)102-7.

At present we can divide eucharistic prayer texts that are in use into four categories:²

1. The four prayers found in the missal of 1969 and which form the core of every missal which cannot be considered apart from the accompanying collection of prefaces (fifty in the Anglophone missal of 2011³).
2. Many others which have been officially sanctioned and intended for use in specific situations (e.g. those for use with children) or where there is a theme running through a specific celebration (e.g. those for reconciliation). Some of these, again the prayers highlighting reconciliation are a good example, have gained such a popularity with some presiders that they have entered more general use alongside the four prayers of the first category.
3. Prayers that have been taken from other sources and have become part of a canon of prayers used by an individual presider or a specific group. The

² Throughout this paper I am concerned with what can empirically be verified in the actual life and worship of the churches – I am using a descriptive language; I am not concerned with what is rubrically authorized in mandated liturgical books in whose prescriptive language there are fewer categories and far fewer anaphoras.

³ The 1973 translation had eighty-one – the reduction in specificity implicit in this reduction in the number of prefaces seems to indicate a trend in Rome during the reign of Pope Benedict XV to see all the liturgical developments in the post-Vatican II period as a moving away from an imagined liturgical ideal of the chaotic liturgy that characterized the missals between 1570 and 1962.

list of the sources of these prayers is virtually endless. There are umpteen printed collections, there are prayers taken from other churches, there are prayers composed by specific groups such as religious orders, and there are those simply downloaded from the web: an alternative anaphora is just a couple of clicks away. When one asks those who use these prayers why they do so – given the presence of the prayers in the first two categories – the answers cluster around two issues. First, that they add the spice of variety, fresh words, different images, and (especially after the arrival of the 2011 translation ⁴) a more proclamation-friendly language. This need for variety would have been readily understood by St Augustine: *quotidiana vilescunt*. The second set of reasons all focus on the notion of the desire for specificity to an occasion, a group, a topic that needs to be brought into the heart of a

⁴ A curious irony of the 2011 translation is that its producers wanted a greater uniformity in the liturgy and a reduction in the number of occasions when presiders introduced their own, occasion specific, wording, but, while this has led to a new woodiness among those who simply ‘follow the book,’ it has also led to many seeking alternatives to the book and so produced less uniformity. This paradoxical situation is not an accident but a function of the contradictions inherent in *Liturgiam authenticam*. See Peter Jeffery, *Translating Tradition: A Chant Historian Reads Liturgiam Authenticam* (Collegeville, MN 2005); on the problems following from the appearance of the 2011 translation, see the essays in Thomas O’Loughlin ed., *Liturgical Language and Translation: The Issues Arising from the Revised English Translation of the Roman Missal* (Norwich 2014).

community's prayer, or a particular sensitivity. An interesting case is the popularity of the so-called 'Star Wars Prayer'⁵ – now showing its age⁶ – which is seen as especially suitable for groups of students who relate to its imagery and for those who want a liturgy highlighting care for the planet. Those who use these prayers often emphasize how a particular prayer gathers together concerns within a celebration and/or gives voice to the stirrings of the Spirit that is animating a group. Interestingly, most who adopt these prayers also further adapt them to make them even more specific. This might simply be adding the name of the pope in a prayer taken from the repertoire of another church, but it can be more detailed as when an additional item of thanks or intercession is added joining the anaphora to an actual community at prayer on a particular day. I have, for instance, heard an anaphora written for use within the Franciscan family further refined to the events significant within the community of the particular religious house where the Eucharist was being celebrated.

4. And lastly, those prayers which are purely of a moment, intended for just one celebration and are not composed with any intention of repeated use.

⁵ Eucharistic Prayer C from *The Book of Common Prayer* of the Episcopal Church of the United States of America.

⁶ It speaks of God making human beings 'the rulers of creation' and names God as 'God of our Fathers ... Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.' I have noticed that in use 'rulers' is now altered to 'stewards' or 'custodians' while I have also noticed the addition of 'God of our Mothers: Sarah, Rebecca, and Rachel.' These changes are further evidence of the need to fine tune anaphoras to their actual situation.

Some time these are completely *ex tempore* in the fashion often found in churches without a tradition of prescriptive liturgical books; and sometimes these are prayers composed in writing and then used on just one occasion. These prayers are very hard to assess precisely because of their ephemeral nature. Suffice to say that while being able to produce an *ex tempore* anaphora was a highly praised skill in the early churches – and is still prized in some churches today – it requires highly developed theological, pastoral, and rhetorical skills coupled with the performance skill to operate without a text-prompt. The writing of a specific prayer seems easier in the study than in the chapel: complex images which ‘work’ on paper will often fail the test of orality and performance. And we must always recall that the eucharistic prayer is the whole prayer event (words, movements, gestures, music, and what others in the assembly apart from the presider and deacon do) and not just the words uttered by the presider as if he were enunciating a formula.⁷

⁷ This image that the eucharistic prayer is solely the work of the presider is still deep within our imagination and is, to a large extent, a legacy of the pre-1970 era when the eucharistic prayer was recited by the priest in silence and others’ actions (the server ringing the bells, the congregation waiting for elevations, and (very occasionally) the choir singing the ‘*sanctus*’ and the ‘*benedictus*’ as two separate pieces either side of the elevations and completely independently of what the priest was saying) were seen as being only ancillary to his: it was the priest’s own Mass and never more so than during the Canon. While we have

Amidst this amazing variety, which I see as one of the manifestations of the Spirit in the church today,⁸ there is a single uniting thread: the desire for specificity, for the prayer to speak for this assembly in its situation today and to speak within this gathering so that the words heard by the group form that one voice that thanks the Father.

Eucharistic specificity

But, we might now ask, is this desire for specificity anything more than the ephemeral desire for that elusive quality called ‘relevance,’ or that of a sales pitch that a liturgy should be tuned to its audience, or that in a culture of ‘personalized’ mass-production that a product has been focused on its consumers? On a preliminary note, we should observe that there is nothing inherently distorted in any of these motives. If people get a highly and sensitively tuned service everywhere else, then the least they can expect is that liturgy should be just as personalized! Likewise, if we gather to celebrate a particular event, be it a feast of the calendar of the *catholica* or a wedding anniversary which is, at least, a memorial in the calendar of one *ecclesiola*, we expect ritual

moved far from this image, it still manifests itself when we think of an eucharistic prayer as ‘what the priest does.’

⁸ It is the diversity of languages forming a single voice to proclaim one faith that is the manifestation of the Spirit within Luke’s theology in Acts 2:5-11. On the origins of this diversity of eucharistic prayers, see John Barry Ryan, *The Eucharistic Prayer: A Study in Contemporary Liturgy* (New York, NY 1974).

specificity and relevance between the day/event/topic and the prayers of the liturgy. Specificity is already built-in to the liturgy in that we have all the variety we find in the sacramentary. Likewise, the whole basis of liturgical time is the alternation of stressed and unstressed moments: each is different, and in noting these differences and celebrating them we are engaged in specificity.

However, the need for liturgical specificity is even more deeply rooted in nature of the Church in its incarnational specificity. We all too glibly use the language of universals, a language borrowed from a certain type of philosophy, in making sense of Christian faith. The classic example is to say 'God became man in Jesus Christ' and then we deduce from that other statements about abstractions such as 'divinity' and 'humanity.' It is far better to say that 'God became a man, an individual named Jesus whom we confess is the Anointed of the Father.' From this we go on to note that he has a life history in a specific culture and time – the specificity that is that of the narrations of the gospel – and that we can relate our specificities to his specificities. Therefore, when we celebrate we are not engaging in a momentary manifestation of the eternal, but acting as real temporal creatures whose vision of God is given to us in another who acted in time. It is our real life we are celebrating, it is the real life of Jesus we are remembering, and we are engaging the divine now. In making our prayer today – where we have existence – we are relating not to some eternal force but, in the Spirit's power, being children of the Father who sustains us in being this very moment.

If we gather for the eucharist today, it is all our memories that give us our identity there, but is from what is happening to us, creatures in the flow of time, that we focus our thanksgiving. We are thankful first for our being – which locates us in this place and time – we are thankful for all that situates us there: the gifts of the creation, the gifts of other creatures, and those gifts which we recognize through faith: the Father’s providence, the advent of the Christ in his Paschal Mystery, and the presence of the Spirit. But all these gifts come to us in even more specific ways – and appreciating these local / individual specificities is part of the joy of faith and the recognition of vocation. The great historical specificities of ‘the faith’ become existential specificities of my life and my community. I have to thank the Father, the creator of heaven and earth, for the wonder of my being, my life, and my relationship to him. I have to thank him for my history, my loved ones and what binds the ‘us’ in which I exist together. I am thankful for our community in which we blossom, and in which each of our vocations takes its unique, never to be repeated, shape. It is in this community that we remember the Christ-event and what his call means for us, and what discipleship of The Way demands of us today: and those demands are as various as our situations. It is in my heart and in this community that the Spirit dwells and in our situations that we must pray to have ear to hear the Spirit’s prompting, and to give voice to the Spirit’s prayer within us. The Spirit is not moving an abstraction, but a real me who is part of a real community in a real situation along the pilgrimage of faith. Our history – how faith came to us and those who have handed it down to us – is as specific as our identity, and our hopes and our futures are as specific as our starting points in this, our now. Eucharist, if real, is specific.

In a similar, but even more felt way, our needs are specific. We may all long for eschatological realization, or salvation, and a heart resting in God, but we pray for courage to face more immediate needs and we desire more specific realizations in time. Faced with a destructive situation, I need the courage to bear witness to the gospel, faced with drought we ask for rain, faced with a war we ask for a very specific cessation of hostilities. We need the Spirit to bring reconciliation after this act of bitterness, to give new life to this person who is locked in anger, to bring peace to this troubled heart.

If saying that 'the Discourse (*Logos*) has come and pitched his tabernacle among us' (Jn 1:14) means anything as reality it means that God is interested in us here where the community in which I exist lives. The tent is pitched near our tents – and tents are pitched here for a moment, then moved. John the Evangelist in picking on this image at the opening of his story recalled that the Father's presence in the desert was in a tent alongside tents, and they moved hither and yon, day by day: so Jesus is the presence in the journeying of life, and it is in that journeying, always here or there, that we relate to the Father through him. The specificity of Jesus within history as the Christ is the key to the significance, value, and importance of specificity in our liturgy.

A liturgical practice of specificity

Two powerful myths are destructive of liturgy. The first is the Neoplatonic myth of 'the alone with the alone.' I imagine that I can rise above, abstract from, or

prescind from the fractured, bit by bit, partial nature of existence. I can ignore time, my materiality, my historical limitations and come to enter some higher detached form of existence: the world of everyday facts becomes just noise interrupting my contemplation of the higher, eternal realities. The pursuit of this dream has been part of the Christian story almost from the beginning. This is ultimately destructive of liturgy – except as an *intra mentem* activity of contemplation – because liturgy involves the creation, it engages with materiality in time. We live in a sacramental universe, and liturgy is a celebration of that universe within that universe: matter and temporality become our bread each day in our encounter with God.

The other myth reached its perfect expression more recently in the story of Robinson Crusoe: alone, monarch of his kingdom, he is self-sufficient. John Donne proclaimed that ‘no man is an island,’ but Daniel Defoe created an image of self-centered contentment, freed from annoyance and with complete self-satisfaction, in his novel’s hero.⁹ Others, when they are not a threat, only come into the picture as those who serve the loner’s needs be they physical or emotional. The myth of the Desert Island paradise appeals to us in myriad forms and is as illusory a vision of existence as the Neoplatonic. We are, and can only, be individuals *in community*, we can only grow when enwrapped in love, and we can only survive as we want to survive in relationship. The Robinson Crusoe

⁹ On this myth’s penetration within our culture, see, for example, Andrew DeGraff and Daniel Harmon, *Plotted: A Literary Atlas* (San Francisco, CA 2015), 32-9.

myth is obviously destructive of liturgy because liturgy is not only common, but is the worship of the *laos tou theou* /*populus Dei* - which are single realities made of many individuals. We are not just people who believe, we form a people who believe and as such a unit we thank God. Faced with these myths – and we are all affected by them – the need for specificity in our liturgy takes on a new urgency.

Only a liturgy that is closely linked to what is happening to us in our lives, in our messy materiality, or contingent historical situation can counter the tendency of belief moving towards a gnostic disinterestedness. Likewise, only a liturgy that is rooted in the common experiences, joys and needs of us as a people - individuals bonded together in relationships – can stress the loving vision of human life that is based in God's covenant in the Christ and assert that unity in the face of un-relational individualism. Specificity is not a trendy extra nor a sales ploy, it makes liturgy the work of God's people in creation. We need to practice specificity in the liturgy as an essential dimension of liturgy in the same way that we appreciate that liturgy has a Liturgy of the Word or that it must have times for silent prayer or must use genuine symbols.

Specificity and the Eucharistic Prayer

If we abandon the notion of an ahistorical liturgy with serious intent – and this is a relatively new idea within Catholic liturgy – then specificity must manifest itself throughout the liturgy while at the same time ensuring that the liturgy preserves its universal dimension as that which bonds actual churches into a

more embracing, but virtual, community the *catholica*. This need finds its apogee in the eucharistic prayer: here the community expresses itself in the Christ to the Father. So what 'shape' could that specificity takes? I suggest we could use four headings to advance our thinking on this:

1. Time

We already make very good use of specificity in our eucharistic prayers by relating the Prayer to the liturgical seasons. This occurs mainly through the prefaces and the special *communicantes* for use with Eucharistic Prayer 1.¹⁰ But themes found in the prefaces often are not picked up and repeated and elaborated in the rest of the anaphora. On a different task, despite its venerable age in the Latin liturgy, Eucharistic Prayer 1 is not really a eucharistic prayer, and insertions such as the *communicantes* are far more noticeable to a presider reading them than they are to someone listening to the prayer in the assembly: by the time one has noted the special bit for the day (assuming one notices it) the prayer has moved on. Perhaps the greatest importance of the prefaces and the additions to the Roman Canon is the precedent they set for the felt importance of time-specificity within the eucharistic prayer.

Two very obvious occasions suggest themselves for eucharistic prayers where the festival being celebrated and the Eucharist come into close alignment: Holy Thursday evening and Easter day. To these could be added other significant days

¹⁰ And there are other special variations within Eucharistic Prayer 1 around Easter.

such Easter evening along with the octave, Pentecost, and special prayer for Christmas. One could argue any number of such specific prayers, but if they are just more verbal formulae for the president – and so require careful listening along with knowledge of other prayers to which they can be compared – then the specificity of the feast may not be sufficient. The whole action of the Anaphora should be such that on these occasions we recognize the prayer as linked to the occasion within our ecclesial memory.

But is time as a basic factor in celebration confined to the great cycle of festivals? What of the cycle of the diocese or parish: do we need a special prayer that identified this community within salvation history. And what of celebration of time among the members of the assembly? Do we as a Christian community want to celebrate birthdays with a prayer that thanks the Father for the person's life, gifts, and skills? How often in smaller communities, especially on those who join in the Eucharist on weekdays, do we hear a congregation sing 'happy birthday' – as indeed they should for they are celebrating a joyful moment in the life of a sister or a brother and gathering for a birthday party is one of the few social liturgies many people experience. But should this not be a cause for thankfulness? If so, just as we have special forms in Eucharistic Prayers 2 and 3 for praying for the dead, should we have special forms for when one of the gathering is celebrating a birthday? And if that is part of the personal sacred time, what others should we be considering?

2. The Liturgy of the Word

The lectionary is one of the great, unsung acts of genius of the liturgical movement and, through the Revised Common Lectionary, an inspiration of the Catholic Church to many other western churches. But the lections often, especially in Ordinary Time, stand without support within the rest of the liturgy. If hearing the gospel together is liturgy – as distinct from catechesis or bible study – then it needs to be anticipated in the prayers before the Liturgy of the Word *and it should form an inspiration* for the Liturgy of the Eucharist, especially the eucharistic prayer. This linkage is already found in some of the prefaces for the seasons – the most notable example is that of the Third Sunday of Lent with the gospel of Year A – and so the liturgy itself acknowledged the principle.

Why is this linking of the gospel proclaimed and the eucharistic prayer so important? The basis for the link lies in the nature of kerugma provoking the response of praise and thanksgiving for what has occurred in the Christ. Liturgy is response to invitation – and the memory of that invitation lives in our recollection of the gospels. Indeed, it could be argued that any eucharistic prayer which does not ‘pick up’ the theme of the gospel in some way is to that extent deficient. We gather for the Eucharist: it is a single action in many moves, but these moves should be coordinated. What we have proclaimed as the message of the Christ to us should be the starting point for our prayer, with him, to the Father.

Do we need a specific eucharistic prayer for each Sunday of Ordinary Time over the three years? This would mean a series of possibly nearly a hundred prayers that would be heard so rarely that we would not develop any familiarity with

them. However, we should have some such complete prayers, some prayers that could have special additions relating to the gospel, and a much larger range of prefaces that are directly tied to the gospel passages that we have just heard proclaimed and expounded. It may be too much to argue that any eucharistic prayer which lacks a serious relationship to the readings is significantly deficient, but it is certainly true that until we have done a great deal more to pray the eucharistic prayer as responding to the gospel proclaimed, we are ignoring an intrinsic relationship at the core of our worship.

3. Distinctive groups

The principle of the importance of eucharistic prayers for use with specific groups has been recognized for several decades since the appearance of the eucharistic prayers for use with children in 1974. Since then we have grown use to themed Eucharistic prayers, although the take up has been very patchy: one can find presbyters who know these 'other prayers' as well as they know the four, but many clergy never move beyond the boundary of the four. One very interesting prayer for a specific group is that for the sick in the Rite of Anointing within Mass where there is a special preface and special intercessions for use with Eucharistic Prayers 1, 2 and 3 – which demonstrates once again that specificity in eucharistic prayers is a formally acknowledged need. However, this particular form is only called for in very unusual circumstances and it hardly impinges on the normal liturgical life of communities. So local churches need to ask themselves who are the special groups with whom we minister and who

assemble as such groups to celebrate the eucharist: any such group that can be identified is a candidate group for a distinct eucharistic prayer.

However, most attention to specific prayers has focused on the notion of an anaphora *for use with* such and such a group: the prayers for eucharists *with* children being the outstanding example of the genre. But what about prayers that celebrate particular groups within the community? Should we consider being explicitly thankful for all who exercise ministries of caring in our communities. Whether such caring is professional (nurses or social workers) or 'accidental' (looking after a long-term sick spouse or a child with problems), it is in caring that many Christians fulfill their vocations and carry out the challenge of discipleship to love one another. Should we not be celebrating this discipleship, being thankful for it and the grace that sustains it, while asking the Father to sustain our sisters and brothers in their lives? In a similar vein, in every assembly there are those who have borne witness over the years, the older people, and should we not be celebrating their contribution to our communities and the life of the Church? And, there are the marginal groups where rather than shunning them we should be celebrating and thankful for their unique witness: in making such marginalized people the centre of our thanksgiving we are demonstrating that as an eucharistic community we have a different set of priorities to those of the larger society where marginalization may be just 'a fact of life.'

4. Local events and needs

Every community has needs that are unique to it, its history, and its challenges. Creating eucharistic prayers that reflect this is one of the challenges that should be taken up by diocesan liturgy groups and groups representing larger regions. There is a tendency in this matter to flee to the extremes. On one side there are those who argue that such local initiatives are contrary to Catholicity and lead to fragmentation. But the facts are against this view: for all of Christian history regions, language communities, dioceses and even political groupings such as kingdoms have noted the need to adapt the liturgy to the needs of the place and the time. In a vernacular liturgy this need is even more profound. On the other hand, there are those who argue for complete spontaneity as a manifestation of the Spirit. But the facts are also against this view: very few have the rhetorical and performance skill to do this well and all it often means is ever more words from a presider. The challenge is for the prayer to draw on the skills of the whole community, reflect the tradition of faith, and be elegant, local, and not a piling up of phrases. Anyone thinking of making an eucharistic prayer more specific by the addition of inserts into existing anaphoras should recall this logion from Matthew: 'and in praying do not heap up empty phrases as the Gentiles do; for they think they will be heard for their many words' (6:7).

It is worth noting that when a community has to face up to the challenge of creating its own eucharistic prayer this may be the first time that they have had to think through what they have been saying 'amen' to for decades. The anaphora is a community's prayer, if a local prayer is needed, it should be a conscious community creation.

Think global, act local

In nearly every discussion of alternative eucharistic prayers that I have heard – and they have been going on, in one way or another, within the Catholic Church since the 1970s¹¹ - one issue is never far beneath the surface: does not such variety, from place to place and celebration to celebration, endanger or damage the universality / catholicity of the Church? The old dream that any Catholic from Connemara in Ireland to Canton in China would feel equally at home, and be familiar with the words, prayers and actions! The first point to make was that while the Cantonese visitor to Connemara might have a sense of familiarity with the rubrics by sight – she would have heard almost nothing – it is also the case that she would have been as little involved actively in the liturgy in each place and would have turned to something more local and active such as the rosary in Irish in one place and Cantonese in the other! We can turn uniformity into a fetish: if it looks the same, it must be so!

However, the concern for catholicity is not misplaced: the church is each community but it is also the whole People of God who from the sun's rising to its

¹¹ In the 1970s there were many very public experiments such as the anaphoras of Thierry Maertens and Huub Oosterhuis (Ryan, op. cit., provides an introductory summary), since around 1980 and the publication of *Inaestimabile donum* that experimentation has become more haphazard and less subject to critical review – but the experimentation has continued driven mainly by pastoral need.

setting offer the thanksgiving sacrifice of praise. Indeed, in our oldest surviving, explicitly Christian, eucharistic prayer we find this:

For as the broken loaf was once scattered over the mountains and then was gathered in and became one, so may your church be gathered together into your kingdom from the very ends of the earth.

Yours is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ forever (*Didache* 9:4).¹²

The particular church thinks of itself in communion with all the churches across the whole earth: this is a unity formed by the Spirit completing the work of the Christ rather than a multi-national driven by common standards. The eucharistic prayer must be the real and specific prayer of this church, a community around the Lord's Table, but it must keep in mind and declare its unity with the whole People of God and this prayer and desire for unity should be part of their discipleship – indeed a witness to another kind of world. Catholicity – in the face of nationalisms, sectarianisms, communal bickering, and colonialism – is part of the challenge of discipleship and it denigrates the Spirit's work to imagine it in terms of ritual uniformity created by adherence to *editiones typicae*.

In whatever form we pray, part of each church's prayer must be:

¹² The translation is taken from Thomas O'Loughlin, *The Didache: A Window on the Earliest Christians* (London 2010), 167; in chapter 6 of that book, pp. 105-28, I examine the notion of being part of an *oikoumene* that was part of the vision of those early churches.

Remember, Lord, your church, deliver her from evil, make her complete in your love, and gather her from the four winds into your kingdom you have prepared for her, for yours is the power and the glory forever (*Didache* 10:5).

When we pray for this church we cannot but pray for the holiness of the whole People of God, for just as an individual Christian cut off from the community is a distortion of what it is to be on a common pilgrimage of faith, so one church praying without an awareness of the larger church is a distortion. But this sensitivity to the whole, to the universality of the church must be a deep consciousness of covenantal bonds – built up by reflection, prayer and action – rather than superficial similarity of ritual forms.

So where are we today? Specificity, particularly in eucharistic prayers, is an aspect of liturgy where the Catholic Church is still feeling its way slowly. We have moved from the rigid uniformity of the Roman Canon to a variety of prayers. We have had many experiments¹³ – and these continue – on the edges, while from Rome we have had a very definite retrenchment on specificity in the ethos found

¹³ See, for example, Robert F. Hoey ed., *The Experimental Liturgy Book* (New York, NY 1973); while this book has now become a curiosity of liturgical history many of the questions it sought to address have only become more acute both theologically and pastorally over the last forty years. Moreover, many of its eucharistic prayers are as fresh today as when they were written and well worth examining as models: for example, the anaphora written by Benedict J. Habiger on pp. 88-91.

in *Liturgiam authenticam* and the Latinisms of the 2011 sacramentary. Behind the experiments, and indeed the negative reaction to diversity we see in texts like *Liturgiam authenticam*, is the realization that acting locally while we think globally is one of the great challenges of liturgy in a global church. There are no easy solutions and there is much work to be done, and the sooner we begin to engage in the conversation about this matter the better.